



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,586	12/28/2001	Guy L. Steele JR.	06502.0373-00000	2878

7590 09/15/2004

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,  
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.  
1300 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

MAI, TAN V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2124

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,586

Applicant(s)

STEELE, GUY L.

Examiner

Tan V Mai

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/27/02, 4/26/02, 11/19/02 & 1/15/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 16 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/27/02, 11/19/02 & 1/15/03
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2124

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because legal phraseology is used in this paragraph (i.e., "comprising"). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). (i.e., "comprising"). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the specification, pages 2 and 10; the status of Co-pending Application Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_ is required to be kept current.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8, 11, 13-14, 17 and 19-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 4-9, 15-17 and 26-28 of copending Application No. 10/028,375. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the "**plurality of floating point operands**" [of instant application] is same as the

Art Unit: 2124

"**first floating point operand** and a **second floating point operand**" [of Application No. 10/028,375] when "plurality" equals 2.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orup.

As per independent claim 1, Orup discloses, e.g., see **Figs. 5-6** & "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION", the invention, **floating point NaN comparator**, substantially as claimed, including: **transform first input operand (602), transform second input operand (604), compare first input to second input (606) and select first or second input based upon comparison (608)**. It is noted that Orup does not specifically detail the claimed "plurality of analysis circuits ... configured to determine a **format** of each of the floating point operands..." feature. However, Orup does disclose "FPU core 94 may use the **tag value** ... Types of special floating point numbers include zero, + infinity, - infinity, and NaNs. By including one bit for each type of special floating point number, FPU core 94 can determine which type of special floating point number the operand represents with minimal decoding" (col. 16, first complete paragraph). It would have

Art Unit: 2124

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the claimed invention according to Orup's teachings, i.e., including the **"tag value" in floating point NaN comparator**, because the proposed device is a **floating point NaN comparator** having "determine a format" as claimed.

As per dependent claim 2, the claim adds the "plurality of operand buffers" for supplying each of the floating point operands. The feature is old and well known in the art for storing desired operands.

As per dependent claim 3, the claim adds the "group of format". Orup discloses the feature, e.g., see col. 2, second complete paragraph.

As per dependent claim 4, the claim adds the "positive overflow" and "negative overflow" formats. These features are well known formats in special floating point number.

As per dependent claim 5, the claim adds the "positive underflow" and "negative underflow" formats. These features are well known formats in special floating point number.

As per dependent claim 6, the claim adds the "positive infinity" and "negative infinity" formats. These features are well known formats in special floating point number.

As per dependent claim 8, the claim adds the "result signal is used to control a floating point unit". The feature is obvious design choice.

As per dependent claim 9, the claim adds the "result signal controls at least one of:...". The feature is obvious design choice.

As per dependent claim 10, the claim adds the "result generator circuit ignores the floating point status information encoded in each of floating point operands". The feature is obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the result generator analyzes "special floating point numbers".

Due to the similarity of claims 11-15 and 17-21 to claims 1-6 and 8-10, they are rejected under a similar rationale.

6. Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al (Applicant's admission Prior Art).

As per independent claim 1, Huang et al disclose, e.g., see **Fig. 4**, the invention, **arithmetic calculation circuit (100)**, substantially as claimed, including: **X and Y operand registers 116 & 118; arithmetic section 114 and special operand generator 122**. It is noted that Huang et al do not specifically detail: the claimed "plurality of analysis circuits ... configured to **determine a format** of each of the floating point operands ..." feature. However, Huang et al do disclose X and Y operand registers each includes a special operand indicator which is stored a special operand of a predetermine set of special operands. Therefore, the Huang et al's feature is equivalent to the claimed plurality of analysis circuits ... configured to **determine a format** of each of the floating point operands ...". It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the claimed invention according to Huang et al's teachings because the device is an

Art Unit: 2124

**arithmetic calculation circuit (100)** having special operand indicator in each operand register as claimed.

As per dependent claim 2, the claim adds the "plurality of operand buffers" for supplying each of the floating point operands. The feature is old and well known in the art for storing desired operands.

As per dependent claim 3, the claim adds the "group of format". Huang et al disclose the feature, e.g., claim 3.

As per dependent claim 4, the claim adds the "positive overflow" and "negative overflow" formats. These features are well known formats in special floating point number.

As per dependent claim 5, the claim adds the "positive underflow" and "negative underflow" formats. These features are well known formats in special floating point number.

As per dependent claim 6, the claim adds the "positive infinity" and "negative infinity" formats. These features are well known formats in special floating point number.

As per dependent claim 8, the claim adds the "result signal is used to control a floating point unit". The feature is obvious design choice.

As per dependent claim 9, the claim adds the "result signal controls at least one of: ...". The feature is obvious design choice.

As per dependent claim 10, the claim adds the "result generator circuit ignores the floating point status information encoded in each of floating point operands". The

Art Unit: 2124

feature is obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the result generator analyzes "special floating point numbers".

Due to the similarity of claims 11-15 and 17-21 to claims 1-6 and 8-10, they are rejected under a similar rationale. It is noted that claim 12 claims "comparing the first floating point operand to comparing the second floating point operand." Huang et al's **arithmetic calculation circuit (100)** is capable of performing the "comparing" function.

7. Claims 7, 16 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cited references are art of interest.

9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the recorded references do NOT teach or suggest: (1) the "format represents a **combination of at least two** of the group" feature as recited in dependent claim 7; and (2) the "result indicates the comparative relationship chosen from a group" feature as recited in dependent claims 16 and 22.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably



Art Unit: 2124

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tan V. Mai whose telephone number is (703) 305-9761. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fri from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are:

Official (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



TAN V. MAI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER